DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 003 CG 007 742

AUTHOR Richardson, James T.
TITLE Expert Power and Opinion Leadership: A Theoretical Integration.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; Field Studies; Group Behavior; *Interpersonal Competence; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; Power Structure; *Research Methodology; *Research Reviews (Publications); Social Influences; *Social Relations; Theories

ABSTRACT

The historical independence of expert power and opinion leadership research and theorizing is noted, with the major credit for the separateness being attributed to differences in methodological approach usually taken in the two areas of research. A theoretical attempt to relate the two areas is make by relating: (1) the general areas of social power and leadership, (2) expert power (a sub-area of social power) to leadership, and (3) expert power to opinion leadership (a sub-area of leadership). Historical evidence for the relationship of opinion leadership and expert power is cited, culminating in some theorizing and research that crosses the usually inviolate methodological lines that have historically separated the two areas of research. References are included. (Author)

ED 071003

EXPERT POWER AND OPINION LEADERSHIP:

A THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 071003

James T. Richardson
Department of Sociology
University of Nevada 89507

Summer, 1971

This work owes much to the initial encouragement of Melvin L. DeFleur. I am grateful for his help, especially in reading earlier drafts of the paper.

Expert Power and Opinion Leadership

A Theoretical Integration

Abstract

The historical independence of expert power and opinion leadership research and theorizing is noted, with the major credit for the separateness being attributed to differences in methodological approach usually taken in the two areas of research. A theoretical attempt to relate the two areas is made, 1) by relating the general areas of social power and leadership, 2) by relating expert power (a sub-area of social power) to leadership, and 3) by relating expert power to opinion leadership (a sub-area of leadership). Historical evidence for the relationship of opinion leadership and expert power is cited, culminating in some theorizing and research that crosses the usually inviolate methodological lines that have historically separated the two areas of research.

Expert Power and Opinion Leadership:
A Theoretical Integration

Introduction

About ten years ago Katz (1960) presented a discussion of the confluence of two hitherto unrelated research traditions--rural sociology studies of innovation diffusion and mass communications research. He noted reasons why the two traditions had continued to work independently, in spite of their obvious similarities, which he specifically detailed. This paper will attempt to render the same service to two other related areas of research--opinion leadership and expert power (and, of necessity, the larger areas of power and leadership). Possible reasons for the lack of mutual appreciation between these two areas will be discussed, along with points of overlap and mutual concern for both types of research. Research and theorizing that has attempted to bridge the two areas will be cited.

Historical Separation of Concepts

A major reason for the lack of congruence between the concepts of expert power and opinion leadership involves the different foci in the two areas. Expert power research has tended to emphasize behavioral control, whereas opinion leadership has focused on control of cognitions. Occasionally there have been breaches of the invisible boundary between the two areas of research, but usually the two areas are thought of as separate. Research in both areas has sometimes made passing reference to the other, but few opinion leadership researchers have explicitly indicated that they were

incorporating behavioral elements, and few expert power studies have stated that they were studying influences on cognitions as well as on behavior.

The reason for this lack of affinity between the areas seems to relate directly to the methodology typically used. Expert power research is usually done in the laboratory, while little overt opinion research is experimental. When one is doing experimental research it is much easier to verify behavioral occurrences than it is to substantiate claims that the cognitions of subjects are thus and such. Also, laboratory groups are usually so transitive that it seems meaningless to study opinion leadership. On the other hand, when one is studying opinion leadership through the use of questionnaires administered to a sample of a population in a field setting, it seems much easier to talk about cognitions than about behavior. In the standard kind of opinion leadership study few references are made to actual behavior, simply because it is difficult to observe and measure in a field setting.

Some attempts are being made to study opinion formation in the laboratory and some are also being made to study social power in field settings. Hopefully these will eventually lead to a fruitful congruence of opinion leadership research with research concerning interpersonal power.

Relationship of Power to Leadership

Expert power research and opinion leadership studies are typically both delineated as sub-areas of larger concerns: expert power is thought of as one segment of social or interpersonal power, while opinion leadership is considered a somewhat independent part

of the general concept of leadership. Therefore it seems logical to first consider any possible connections between the general concepts of power and leadership.

Janda (1960:353), in a study of power and leadership, made a scathing comment concerning the usual manner of relating the two concepts.

> The first thing to be noted in a comparative review of the literature on leadership and that on power is that there is almost no overlap between the two. Studies of leadership and studies of power have been conducted almost independently of each other.

The point made by Janda is well taken. Most studies of power and of leadership do ignore work in the other area. Two possible alternative explanations for the situation Janda describes are, (1) the concepts are not related--an obviously untenable position, or (2) the researchers have not yet been able to relate the concepts. This last alternative appears to be the most acceptable. The relationship between the two concepts has not been made clear probably because the concepts themselves usually are vaguely defined. This is less true concerning the concept of leadership because of the contemporary emphasis on the situational or functional conceptualizations of leadership.[1] However, there have been many difficulties in conceptualizing social power. Before attempting to relate power and leadership, some problems of defining power must be briefly explicated, and an acceptable alternative chosen.

Cartwright (1959) has indicated that he believes social power to be perhaps the most important and most neglected variable of social psychology. Only recently have theorists made some headway across what Dahl (1957) calls the "bottomless swamp" of power theory.

Wrong (1968) made a major contribution by differentiating between actual and potential power. Mayhew, et al., (1969) developed this argument and cited theorists that adopt such a "latent force" interpretation of power.[2] They note that such interpretations of power create conceptual problems because of confusion between power and bases or sources of power. This in turn causes measurement difficulties since latency definitions require the researcher to impute motivation, abilities, and knowledge to those he is investigating.

Mayhew, et al., (1969) present a less ambiguous approach to power by disallowing latency conceptualizations, emphasizing instead control achieved in the exchange of behavior. The power of one individual is simply the degree to which he is able to control the actual behavior of another (or of a group of others). By delineating power in this fashion one is able to measure quite precisely the power possessed by each individual of a group at any time or over time. Relative differences in power are easily discernible, as is delineation of the power structure of a group. One only needs to look at the relative amounts of control achieved over other members by each member in order to place that member in the group power structure. Fluctuations of the relative amounts of power possessed by each group member (the power structure) can be clearly seen, much more so than when latency conceptions of power are used.[3] This behavioral conceptualization of power will be adopted for use in this paper.

Theorists have made attempts to relate the concepts of power and leadership. Cartwright and Zander (1960:500) make such an

attempt, but their initial latency conceptualizations of power detracts from the statement they make that "...leadership clearly involves the use of power." They emphasize the close ties again as they say "Acts of leadership, if they are to be effective, must rely upon some basis of power." French and Snyder (1959:118), in research designed to clarify the relationship between power and leadership, propose what they call

> ...a restricted definition of leadership in terms of power: Leadership is the potential social influence of one part of a group over another. If one member has power over another, then he has some degree of leadership.

Their work suffers from the same weakness as that of Cartwright and Zander in terms of conceptualization and they do not again mention power per se. Instead, they use the term influence, which is operationalized in several different ways.

Some theorists have tried to relate leadership to power structures, but most have not employed an easily measured concept of leadership. Lack of success has been a product largely of the conceptual problems already discussed. Thus, French (1956:191) says, "To a large extent leadership consists of a member's ability to influence others both directly and indirectly by virtue of his position in the power structure...."

A more workable approach is that of Marak (1964:175). His study of the evolution of leadership relates leadership and power as follows:

> The development of a leadership structure--an asymmetry in the relative frequencies of control and compliance acts initiated and received by the members of a group--depends upon a situation in which one person has more power than another.

Marak's definition of leadership structure is markedly similar to the Mayhew et al. delineation of power. The idea implied in Marak's statement is that an individual occupies a position in the group leadership structure by virtue of his place in the power structure. In other words, an individual who has power, from whatever base it be derived, has, at the same time and in correspondence to his relative position in the power structure, a place in the group leadership structure. This approach to leadership is behavioral, and is quite precise in its depiction of the group power structure at any moment in time.

Following Marak (1964), this paper takes the position that the sufficient and necessary condition for the presence in a group of a leadership structure is that there be a power structure. The leadership and power structures are, for all practical purposes, defined as being the same. The external referent in this seeming circularity is the concept of power, which is defined explicitly in behavioral terms, as illustrated in Mayhew et al., (1969).

Expert Power

French and Raven (1959), in a seminal work in the area of power, present a summation of many heretofore unsystematized ideas concerning various bases of social power. French and Raven discuss reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power. Of these concepts, expert power, which Secord and Backman (1964:276), following French and Raven, say is "...based on the perception that O has some special knowledge or expertness," is probably the least specifically examined in research. Nevertheless, this concept seems to be one of the most important presented.[4] Richardson

(1968, 1969) examines the history of expert power and notes that it has seldom been demonstrated that a causal relationship exist between expertise and social power, although much of the literature of social psychology seems to assume such. Richardson's research, which examines the operation of expertise with controls for sex and communication pattern, indicated the necessity of qualifying and discussion of expert power by including a discussion of the specific structural and situational factors involved.

The Relationship of Expert Power to Leadership

Before discussing expert power and opinion leadership it is necessary to relate the general concept of leadership to expert power. One way of accomplishing this is to refer again to the work of Janda who, as has been noted, says leadership is a "particular type of power relationship." He further says (1960:358) that this relationship is "...characterized by a group member's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a member of a particular group."

Such an approach dovetails with the concept of expert power. It seems reasonable to think that an expert in an area of knowledge or skill is perceived by others in the accompanying social situation as having a right, by virtue of his position in the power structure to prescribe behavior for them. The position of the expert in the power structure has been gained because of his relative expertise at the salient group undertaking. As long as the expert maintains his position in the power structure, he can exercise power commensurate with his position. If, however, he loses his position in the

power structure by virtue of the loss of saliency for his ability by the other members (task is finished, learning on the part of other group members which changes the relative amounts of expertise possessed by group members, etc), then the amount of power that he can exercise deteriorates accordingly. Stated more simply, the expert has the "right" to exercise power (leadership) because of his position in the group power structure. As long as this position does not change, his "right" continues. This position is implied by Mudlner (1960:245), who talks of "relevant qualities" of an individual that are "... directly related to the occupancy of power positions, for instance abilities that may give someone a 'right' to claim a power position."

Expert Power and Opinion Leadership

One result of relating a general behavioral conceptualization of leadership to expert power is that opinion leadership processes are clarified. (See Rogers (1962:209) for a list of synonyms for opinion leadership.) The clarification requires an expansion of Janda's idea of the right to prescribe behavior to include the right to prescribe cognitive patterns as well. This appears to be a logical and simple extension, but qualifications should be made concerning the conditions under which such effects may, in fact, occur.

Kelman (1961:65) has pointed out that compliance in terms of behavior may occur without any change in the cognitive structure of the individual. In fact, permanent changes in the cognitive structure of an individual can take place, Kelman says, only in the process of "internalization," "...which occurs when the induced

behavior is congruent with his value system." Thus Secord and Backman (1964:123) say in their discussion of Kelman's ideas, "The recommendations of an expert are accepted if they appear to be congruent with one's values." Also, French and Raven (1959) note that some power bases, such as that of coercive power, do not lead to permanent cognitive changes, but that referent power may well do so. They seem to agree that congruency of values is necessary if cognitive changes are to occur. Thus, in situations where there is no question of a conflict in values occurring, it seems reasonable to extend Janda's idea to include cognitive patterns as well as behavior.

Evidence for the Relationship

The fact that there is a relationship between expertise and opinion leadership is assumed by a number of theorists. Secord and Backman (1964:215), following Katz (1957), list as one of three characteristics of opinion leaders that "... they are competent," explaining further, "...competence often means that the leader has more expert knowledge than others." Moore (1921) was one of the first to examine empirically the relationship. Marple (1933) and Burtt and Falkenburg (1941) were others who did early research on the variables of expertise and opinions. The early 1950's saw several noteworthy contributions in the area. Stycos (1952:70) pointed out the great importance in rural Greece of possessing the ability to read the newspaper, and concluded, "In an underdeveloped country the 'opinion leader's' importance is greatly magnified, due to his monopoly on certain scarce skills."

Festinger, et al., (1952), in a classic experimental study of

"extreme deviants," treated the perceived presence or absence of experts as one of their important independent variables. Their findings suggest that such perceptions do have an influence on the opinions of deviate members. The design of their study probably detracted from drawing definite conclusions, for group members in the "expert present" condition did not know who was supposed to be the expert. If the design had made this apparent, then probably more precision would have been attained in the measurement of opinion changes and their causes.

Investigations of "source credibility" also are relevant. Hovland and Weiss (1952:642) found that "Subjects changed their opinion in the direction advocated by the communicator in a significantly greater number of cases when the material was attributed to a 'high credibility' source than when attributed to a 'low credibility' source." Also, Talland (1954), in an experimental study designed to investigate an earlier finding (by Chowdhry and Newcomb, 1952) that leaders are better able to assess group opinions, suggested that, contrary to Chowdhry and Newcomb, the primary reason for this finding is that leaders actually influence the formation of group opinion. This was substantiated in Talland's research for he says,

> The results confirm the hypothesis that leaders influence the formation of group opinion when this emerges in the course of discussion, and that this influence is likely to account to some extent for the finding that leaders make the most accurate evaluations of group opinion (1954: 433).

The middle 1950's saw several more studies that bear on the fusing of the two concepts, including the Menzel and Katz (1956)

study of innovation in the medical profession, the Katz and Lazarsfeld book, Personal Influence (1957), which is a study of influence patterns in Decatur, Illinois, and the Robert Merton study of "Rovere," a town on the Eastern seaboard (Merton, 1957).

Menzel and Katz (1956) indicate the applicability of the "twostep flow of communications" hypothesis to their work. They conclude that there is, at least in their population, a "multistep flow of communications." They emphasize status considerations in this analysis, suggesting that the flow of opinion leadership or personal influence is from those of high status to those of lower status.[5] If one can accept their initial conclusions concerning prestige and its relationship to opinion leadership, and, if we can sssume, as they seem to, that expertise is a major source of prestige in the medical profession, then their findings lend credence to the attempt to relate the concepts of expert power and opinion leadership.

Katz and Lazarsfeld (1957:3) in the introduction to their work, define opinion leaders as "...individuals who were likely to influence other persons in their immediate environment." Throughout their work Katz and Lazarsfeld use interchangeably the words "expert" and "opinion leader." Note their statement of this.

> From the point of view of the person influenced, the opinion leader type whom we shall sometimes call the "general influential" and sometimes the "expert" is a person in whom one has confidence and whose opinions are held in high regard (1957:140).

Thus, their work refers many times to "experts" in public affairs, "experts" in marketing, "experts" in fashion, and "experts" in movies.

The Merton study is probably best remembered for its use of the concepts "locals" and "cosmopolitans." A complete delineation of the concepts of locals and cosmopolitans is probably unnecessary. Suffice to say that, while both groups of influentials exerted their influence locally, they differed greatly in terms of basic orientations. The locals were oriented toward Rovere; the cosmopolitans were not. The cosmopolitans were definitely more interested in the world outside Rovere. The locals were likely to have grown up in Rovere; thus, they had worked their way up the local status ladder. The cosmopolitans were typically newcomers to Rovere who had entered the status hierarchy at the relatively high level of virtue of their being assigned to an executive position in a Rovere business firm.

Merton says that the locals were influentials by virtue of whom they knew rather than what they knew. The cosmopolitans, however, are influentials partially because of <u>what they knew</u> (their expertise) and partially because of who they were (status considerations with overtones of prestige possibly derived from their expertise). In discussing the cosmopolitan Merton says,

> His influence rests upon an imputed expertness rather than the sympathetic understanding of others. . . . The cosmopolitan is sought out for his specialized skills and experience; the other for his intimate appreciation of intangible but affectively significant details (1957: 403).

Merton carries his analysis further by presenting a dichotomous view of spheres of influence. He applies the terms monomorphic and polymorphic to describe spheres of activity in which the influentials exert opinion leadership. Of special interest is his concept of monomorphic influentials.

> Some influentials, and these may be termed monomorphic, are repeatedly cited as exerting influence, but only in one rather narrowly defined area--e.g., the area of politics, or of canons of good taste, or of fashion. The monomorphic influentials are the "experts" in a limited field, and their influence does not diffuse into other spheres of decision (1957:414).

This study certainly allows interpretation in terms of the concept of expert power, thus giving substantiation to the claim that these two phenomena are closely related.

Two more recent works in the area of opinion leadership, one a theoretical work by DeFleur (1962), the other an empirical work by El-Assal (1967) also demonstrate the relationship of expertise and opinion leadership. The DeFleur work is an insightful and provocative discussion of mass communication theory and opinion leadership processes. He lists in his discussion ten major "conditions of opinion leadership" three of which are relevant here (1962:262-273). Two of the conditions have closely related but independent ideas concerning perception of expertise. One deals with the degree to which the group regards the potential opinion leader as competent or expert in the specific area of interest to the group. The other concerns the degree to which group members view themselves as lacking expertness or competence in the relevant area. He says in regard to the first point that "Competence...will determine in part the extent to which an individual can influence the beliefs, opinion, and actions of others." Note the inclusion of both cognitive and behavioral elements in his statement.[6] Later, in a discussion of possible relationships between conditions, DeFleur notes that the two factors may be independently important, but that "...relative competence (the ratio between leader and average member

competence) would provide a more meaningful variable predicting the emergence of opinion leadership."

Closely related to the conditions involving perceived expertise, or lack of it, is another which DeFleur says may be "...the most important of the general conditions under which opinion leadership arises within a group" (1962:271). This is the degree to which the group experiences reinforcement following compliance to a potential opinion leader's suggestion. He suggests that reinforcement theory may be the "theoretical mechanism" that can account for the formation and stabilizing of an influence structure in a group. This idea is related to what is generally called exchange theory, as it is presented by Homans (1960) and others.

DeFleur also recommends that small group techniques can be brought to bear on studies of the flow of opinion leadership. El-Assal, one of DeFleur's students at Indiana University, has heeded the recommendation and done a substantial laboratory study in the area of opinion leadership (1967). El-Assal combines role theory and exchange theory to aid in explaining the actual process of opinion leadership. He summarizes this combinaton as follows:

> (A person) seeks advice from the person with whom he shares similar orientations and outlooks and whom, in addition he perceives as competent, knowledgeable, and informed in the context of advice. Upon locating such a person as opinion leader, interaction proceeds with a set of role expectations. The (role expectations) are determined by the costs and rewards which are involved in the seeking and giving of advice (1967:197-198).

In the experiment itself one person from each group was randomly selected to be the one with "high access to the context of ideas." To accomplish this one group member's answers to an

ambiguous group task were said by the experimenter to be correct This established him as the one with competence, and it was predicted that others would seek more advice and be more prone to adhere to the advice from him than from other "average" members Most of the specific hypotheses were substantiated and all showed trends in the predicted direction This design seems to be an improvement over that of Festinger, et al., (1952), which was discussed earlier, simply because of the specificity concerning who was and who was not the expert

Conclusions and Summary

DeFleur, Al-Assal, and others such as Rogers (1962) and Bogart (1967) have pointed out that most research in the area of opinion leadership has only described, in a shallow way, opinion leadership They say, sometimes quite explicitly, that we need to do more than describe We need to understand the process of opinion leadership. It is hoped that this discussion of expertise and expert power, with its emphasis on the relationship of cognitions and behavior, can help delineate what is actually occurring in the formation of group opinion, as well as helping to clarify the actual operation of expertise in the accrual of social power Major theoretical points made in the paper may be summarized as follows:

1 Research and theorizing in opinion leadership and in expert power have usually remained separate although they are plainly related This has probably occurred because of contrasting methodological approaches taken by researchers in the two areas, one of which has focused

on behavior (experimental studies of social power) and the other of which has emphasized cognitions (field studies of opinion leadership)

2. The relating of opinion leadership and expert power requires, first of all, a relating of the more general concepts of power and leadership--something that is accomplished by disallowing usual "potentiality" definitions of social power and adopting instead a strictly behavioral approach to power (Mayhew, et al., 1969), which meshes nicely with Marak's (1964) theorizing concerning leadership structures.

3. Expert power, which has been examined by Richardson (1968, 1969), is related to the general concept of leadership through the use of Janda's (1960) idea that leaders are perceived as having a "right" to prescribe behavior patterns. The point is made that expertise at a group task can be a major reason why group members would decide another had the "right" to dictate behavior.

4. Expert power is then related to opinion leadership by extending Janda's (1960) idea of the right to prescribe behavior to include the prescription of cognitive patterns as well. Theorizing by Kelman (1961), especially his concept of "internalization," is used to qualify the relationship.

5. An historical examination of research and theorizing that evidences the relationship of expert power and opinion leadership is then presented. Special emphasis is given

the theorizing of DeFleur (1962), who recommends that experimental techniques be used in the study of opinion leadership, and to the empirical work of El-Assal (1967), a former student of DeFleur's, who does a highly controlled and valuable study of opinion leadership in the laboratory.

Footnotes

[1]See Gibb (1966 and 1969), Carter (1953), Secord and Backman (1964), Hollander (1967), Mann (1959), Bavelas (1960), and Stogdill (1948) for discussions of this transition from an emphasis on leadership as a personality trait to leadership as a necessary function of the group, which is largely determined by the task situation. This shift of emphasis is best illustrated by the work of Carter, et al., (1949, 1950, 1951). This research team began research with the "trait approach" but their findings brought about a change, which is best presented in the 1953 Carter article.

[2]Many theorists incorporate into their definitions of power the idea of potential or latency. Bierstedt (1950:738) simply states that "power is latent force, force is manifest power." Katz and Kahn (1966:220) say power "...refers to potential acts, rather than to transactions actually occurring." Lippitt, Polansky, and Rosen (1952:39) include potentiality in their definition of power. Jones and Gerard (1967:716) define power as, "A person's ... capacity to influence others...." Wilensky (1956:178) uses the term to mean "the ability to employ force, i.e., to apply effective coercive sanctions." Thibaut and Kelley (1959:101) using concepts of exchange theory, state, "Generally, we can say that the power of A over B increases with A's ability to effect the quality of outcomes attained by B." Many of the contributors to Cartwright's Studies in Social Power (1959) use the latency type of definition (e.g., Cohen, Rosen, Levinger, Wolfe, and French and Raven). Also, Collins and Raven (1969) adopt a "potential influence" definition

of social power. Other such conceptualizations could be mentioned, but these suffice to illustrate.

[3]See Mayhew, et al., (1969) for a fuller discussion and for specific measures suggested for use in studying social power.

[4]The theoretical significance of the expertise is delineated in the work of Thibaut and Kelley (1959:109), Blau (1967) and Secord and Backman (1964). Thibaut and Kelley emphasize the relationship of expertness to the ability to reward, citing expertise as having special meaning in terms of exchange theory. Blau (1967) and Secord and Backman (1964) treat expertise as one of several "resources" that they say leads to social power.

[5]They are forced to qualify this conclusion by noting that there appears to be a role differentiation in their sample, with some who are not leaders (using any of the criteria whereby they designate leaders) serving as innovators for the group as a whole. (This intriguing finding is contradicted, they note, by other research being conducted by them.)

[6]In discussing the second point DeFleur gives a clue as to how expertise may operate to make the expert an opinion leader, something that most of the other theorists mentioned have not done. A long passage will be quoted here to make his ideas explicit. Note the possible similarities between the DeFleur statement and the earlier-presented theorizing of Thibaut and Kelley (1959) in footnote four.

> If group members perceive themselves as lacking competence in some degree, this will undoubtedly be a source of anxiety--depending upon the extent to which the subject matter of that incompetence is important to the group. A situation in which individuals lack competence is likely to be one of ambiguity and potential threat, that is one without adequate frames of reference within which to interpret events and formulate action. This, in turn, may be a necessary condition for the initial establishment of opinion leadership. If, in such a potentially threatening or unstructured situation, one individual interprets the events, suggests action, or otherwise relieves anxiety by almost any sort of structuring of the situation, he is likely to emerge from the encounter having influenced other group members and will very likely have set the stage for further influencing in similar situations (1962:226).

DeFleur's statement is reminiscent of Hemphill's concept of "structure initiation," which is used as an explanation of why certain individuals achieve leadership positions. (See Hemphill, et al., (1956, 1957) for examples of the use of this concept.) Also, one is reminded of the research on leadership stability in crisis situations. Hamblin (1958), in an often-cited study, attributes changes of leadership in crisis situations to the fact that the old leader does not offer the structuring required of the new situation, while perhaps another group member can and does offer such structuring, thus becoming the new group leader. The study done by Katz, Blau, Brown, and Strodtbeck (1957), though less well done, contributes similar interpretations to leadership changes.

REFERENCES

Blau, Peter

1967 Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bavelas, A.

1960 "Leadership: Man and Function," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV (March): 491-498.

Bierstedt, R.

1950 "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review, XV (December):730-738.

Bogart, L.

1967 "No Opinion, Don't Know, and Maybe No Answer," The Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXI, No. 3 (Fall):331-345.

Burtt, H. E. and D. R. Falkenburg, Jr.

1941 "The Influence of Majority and Expert Opinion on Religious Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, 14: 269-278.

Carter, L. F.

1953 "Leadership and Small-Group Behavior," Group Relations at the Crossroads. Edited by Muzafer Sherif and M. D. Wilson. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Carter, L. F., W. Haythorn, and M. Howell

1950 "A Further Investigation of the Criteria of Leadership," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV (April): 350-358.

Carter, L. F., and M. Nixon

1949 "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Four Criteria of Leadership Ability for Three Different Tasks," The

Journal of Psychology, XXVII (January):245-261.

Cartwright, Dorwin, (ed.)

1959 Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Cartwright, D., and A. Zander

1960 "Leadership and Group Performance: Introduction," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. 2nd ed. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper and Row.

Chowdhry, K., and T. M. Newcomb

1952 "The Relative Abilities of Leaders and Non-Leaders to Estimate Opinions of Their Own Groups," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXXVII (January):51-57.

Collins, B. E., and B. H. Raven

1969 "Group Structure: Attraction, Coalitions, Communication and Power," pp. 102-204 in Gardner Lindzey and Elliott Arnonson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. IV, 2nd ed. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Dahl, R. A.

1957 "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, II (July):201-215.

DeFleur, M. L.

1962 "The Emergence and Functioning of Opinion Leadership: Some Conditions of Informal Influence Transmission," Decisions, Values, and Groups. Vol. II. Edited by Norman F. Washburne. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.

El-Assal, M. M. E.

1967 "An Experimental Study of Opinion Leadership: Theoretical Formulation and Test of Selected Variables." Unpublished

Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Festinger, L., H. B. Gerard, B. Hymovitch, H. H. Kelley, and B. Raven

1952 "The Influence Process in the Presence of Extreme Deviates," Human Relations, V (November):327-346.

French, J. R. P., Jr.

1956 "A Formal Theory of Social Power," The Psychological Review, LXIII (May):181-194.

French. J. R. P., Jr., and B. Raven

1959 "The Bases of Social Power," Studies in Social Power. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan.

French. J. R. P., Jr., and R. Snyder

1959 "Leadership and Interpersonal Power," Studies in Social Power. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1959.

Gibb, C. A.

1966 "The Principles and Traits of Leadership," Small Groups. Rev. ed. Edited by A. Paul Hare, E. F. Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

1969 "Leadership." Pp. 205-282 in Vol. IV, of The Handbook of Social Psychology, 2nd edition, Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, editors. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Hamblin, R. L.

1958 "Leadership and Crisis," Sociometry, XXI (December):322-335.

Hemphill, J. K., P. N. Pepinsky, A. E. Kaufman, and M. E. Lipetz

1957 "Effects of Task Motivation and Expectancy of Accomplishment Upon Attempts to Lead," Psychological Monographs, LXXI, No. 451:1-16.

Hemphill, J. K., P. N. Pepinsky, R. N. Shevitz, W. E. Jaynes, and C. A. Christner

1956 "The Relation Between Possession of Task-Relevant Information and Attempts to Lead," Psychological MOnographs, LXX, No. 414:1-24.

Hollander, E. P. and R. G. Hunt (Eds.)

1967 "Leadership, Innovation, and Influence: An Overview," Current Perspective in Social Psychology. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hovland, C. I., and W. Weiss

1952 "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (Winter): 635-650.

Janda, K. F.

1960 "Towards the Explication of the Concept of Leadership in Terms of the Concept of Power," Human Relations, XIII (November):345-363.

Jones, Edward E., and Harold B. Gerard

1967 Foundations of Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn

1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Katz, E.

1957 "The Two-Step Flow of Communication: An Up-to-Date Report on an Hypothesis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 21: 61-78.

1960 "Communication Research and the Image of Society: Convergence of Two Traditions," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (March):435-440.

Katz, E., P. M. Blau, M. L. Brown, and F. Strodtbeck

1957 "Leadership Stability and Social Change: An Experiment with Small Groups," Sociometry, XX (March):36-50.

Katz, E., and P. F. Lazarsfeld

1955 Personal Influence. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Kelman, H. C.

1961 "Processes of Opinion Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXV (Spring):57-78.

Lippitt, R., N. Polansky, and S. Rosen

1952 "The Dynamics of Power," Human Relations, V (February):37-64.

Mann, R. D.

1959 "A Review of the Relationships Between Personality and Performance in Small Groups," Psychological Bulletin, LVI (July):241-270.

Marak, G. E., Jr.

1964 "The Evolution of Leadership Structure," Sociometry, XXVII (June):174-182.

Marple, C. H.

1933 "The Comparative Suggestibility of Three Age Levels to the Suggestion of Groups vs. Expert Opinion," Journal of

Social Psychology, 3: 176-186.

Mayhew, B. H., Jr., L. N. Gray, and J. T. Richardson

1969 "Behavioral Measurement of Operating Power Structures: Characterizations of Asymmetrical Interaction," Sociometry, 32, No. 4 (December):474-489.

Menzel, H., and E. Katz

1955 "Social Relations and Innovations in the Medical Profession: The Eipdemiology of a New Drug," Public Opinion Quarterly, XIX (Winter):337-352.

Merton, Robert K.

1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Moore, H. T.

1921 "The Comparative Influence of Majority and Expert Opinion," American Journal of Psychology, XXXII (January):16-20.

Mudler, M.

1960 "The Power Variable in Communication Experiments," Human Relations, XIII (August):241-257.

Richardson, J. T.

1968 "Expertise, Power, Leadership, and Personal Influence: An Integration of Theory and Experimental Evidence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

1969 "Expert Power: A Behavioral Interpretation," paper read at the 1969 annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Anneheim, California.

Rogers, Everett M.

1962 Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Secord, Paul F., and Carl W. Backman

1964 Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Stogdill, R. M.

1948 "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," The Journal of Psychology, XXV (January):35-71.

Stycos, J. M.

1952 "Patterns of Communication in a Rural Greek Village," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVI (Spring):59-70.

Talland, G. A.

1954 "Assessment of Group Opinion by Leaders and Their Influence on Its Formation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXXIX (July):431-434.

Thibaut, John and Harold Kelley

1959 The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wilensky, Harold L.

1956 Intellectuals in Labor Unions. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Wrong, D.

1968 "Some Problems in Defining Social Power," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (May):673-681.